

| | | | |
|---|------------------|--------------|--|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/035,736 | SMITH ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Callie E. Shosho | 1714 | |

All Participants:
Status of Application: Allowed

 (1) Callie E. Shosho.

(3) _____.

 (2) Judith Byorick.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 12 May 2005
Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed: _____

Claims discussed:

1, 11, 21, 24

Prior art documents discussed:

Vieira et al. (U.S. 5,096,781)
Part II.
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

The examiner's amendment was agreed to and authorized by Ms. Byorick. Claims 1, 11, 21, and 24 were each amended in order to distinguish the claims from Vieira et al. Claim 21 was additionally amended to correct inadvertent typing error.

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the ~~Notice of Allowability~~. Part II above.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)